



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,773	06/30/2000	Ryszard W. Dyrga	042390.P8723	2339

7590 12/10/2003

Gregory D Caldwell
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

ODLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2662

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/608,773

Applicant(s)

DYRGA ET AL.

Examiner

David Odland

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The following is a response to the amendments filed on 11/17/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 3-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claims 1 and 12, the claims recite "...the ability to simultaneously address each of the physical communication ports..." in line 13 and 14. This limitation is confusing; because of the term 'ability' it is unclear whether the control units are actually doing the simultaneous addressing. Also, it is unclear what is meant by 'simultaneous address'. Are addresses inserted into packets at the same time? Are the packets transmitted at the same time? Are the ports given addresses at the same time? These confusing aspects of the claim make the claim indefinite.

Claims 3-11 and 13-17 are rejected because they depend on rejected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2662

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1,3,4,6-10 and 12-14,16 and 17, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganmukhi et al. (USPN 5,953,314), hereafter referred to as Ganmukhi, in view of Kinoshita (USPN 5,802,047), hereafter referred to as Kinoshita, and further in view of Ofek (USPN 6442135), hereafter referred to as Ofek.

Referring to claims 1 and 12, Ganmukhi discloses an apparatus comprising:

a first interface comprising a plurality of physical communication ports to transmit data to and receive data from a plurality of network devices (a switch comprising an interface comprising a first interface comprising a plurality of ports (see the left hand side of the switch in figure 1));

a first control unit communicatively coupled to the first interface to process at least a first subset of the data (a first control processor coupled to the first interface to process data (see figure 1 and columns 1 and 2));

a second control unit communicatively coupled to the first interface and the first control unit to process at least a second subset of the data (a second control processor coupled to the first interface and first control processor to process data (see figure 1 and columns 1 and 2));

a second interface communicatively coupled between the first interface and the first and second control units (a second interface coupled to the first interface and the two control processors (see figure 1 and columns 1 and 2)) such that either one of the first and second control units may communicate with any of the plurality of network devices if the other of the first and

Art Unit: 2662

second control units fails (if one control processor fails the other control processor will commence control processing of data from network devices coupled to both interfaces (see figure 1 and abstract and columns 1 and 2)). Ganmukhi does not disclose a logical network interface to provide multiple logical communication ports that are coupled to the physical ports of the first interface. However, Kinoshita discloses a system wherein physical ports of the router has associated logic ports (see figure 9, column 2 lines 31-50 and column 5 lines 6-11 and claim 1)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the interfaces of Ganmukhi comprise a plurality of logical ports as discloses in Kinoshita because, as Kinoshita points out in column 2 lines 26-43, doing so would allow the interfaces to communicate with an increased number of other network nodes without having to increase the number of physical ports.

Furthermore Ganmukhi does not disclose that the logical interface gives the control units the ability to simultaneously address each of the physical ports. However, Ofek discloses a system wherein a switch is given the ability to multicast packets to output ports (see (*&(*&*&(). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature in Ganmukhi because transmitting packets simultaneously is faster than transmitting packets one-by-one, thereby making the Ganmukhi system operate quicker.

Referring to claim 3, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Ganmukhi does not disclose that the first interface comprises two logical communication ports for each one of the plurality of physical communication ports. However, Kinoshita discloses a system wherein each physical port has associated with it a plurality of logical ports (see figure 9, column 2 lines 31-50, column 5 lines 6-11 and claim 1)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at

Art Unit: 2662

the time of the invention to have the first interface of Ganmukhi comprise two logical ports as discloses in Kinoshita because, as Kinoshita points out in column 2 lines 26-43, doing so would allow the interface to communicate with an increased number of other network nodes rather than just one other node without having to increase the number of physical ports.

Referring to claim 4, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ganmukhi discloses each of the first and second control units further comprises:

a memory device to store one or more data transmission protocols (the control processors have memory and control the operations of multiple protocols such as ATM and Ethernet (see figure 2 and column 2)); and

a processor coupled to the memory device to process network data based at least in part upon the one or more data transmission protocols (the control processor comprises an ATM processor (see figure 2)).

Referring to claim 6, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ganmukhi discloses that the system further comprises a non-volatile memory device coupled to the first and second control units to store configuration data for use by the first and second control units (each processor comprise non-volatile storage wherein it stores stat information (see column 4 lines 8-20)).

Referring to claim 7, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore Ganmukhi discloses that the system comprises a chassis (the apparatus comprises a chassis containing cards (see figure 1 and column 2 lines 39-42)) and at least one of the first and second control units is embodied within a second blade secured within the chassis (each control processor is embedded within a card that is inserted into a chassis (see figure 1 and column 2

Art Unit: 2662

lines 48-42)). Ganmukhi does not disclose that the non-volatile memory device is embodied within a first blade secured within the chassis. Rather Ganmukhi discloses that the non-volatile memory is incorporated within the control processors themselves (see figure 2 and column 4 lines 8-20)). However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the non-volatile memory as a separate blade secured within the chassis because doing so would allow such memory to be easily replaced if it becomes inoperable whereas in Ganmukhi if the non-volatile memory becomes inoperable the entire control processor would have to be replaced, which would be more costly. Furthermore, implementing the non-volatile memory on a separate blade would allow a user of the system to use which ever type of non-volatile memory he or she wishes (i.e. different brands, RAM, flash PROM, ect...) thereby making the system of Ganmukhi more flexible.

Referring to claim 8, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Ganmukhi does not disclose that the first and second interfaces are embodied within an ASIC. However, ASIC devices are highly specialized processing circuit that are used to consolidate the operation normally performed by many chips into a single package, thereby decreasing board size (or the amount of space taken up by chips on a board) and power consumption. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to embody the interfaces of Ganmukhi within an ASIC because doing so would decrease board size required by the interfaces and reduce the power consumption by the interfaces.

Referring to claims 9, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ganmukhi discloses that the first control unit is associated with a first network address and the second control unit is associated with a second network address (each of the control processors

Art Unit: 2662

are implemented on separate cards that are inserted into a card cage and communicate over busses and back channels, therefore inherently there must be addresses associated with these cards in order for data to be sent to the active control processor (see figure 1 and columns 2,4 and 5)).

Referring to claim 10, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ganmukhi discloses that the first and second control units each independently maintain network status information (each control processor has exclusive control over central resources and internal resources such as the Management Ethernet port, buses and alarm signals (see column 3 lines 13-36)).

Referring to claim 13, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Ganmukhi does not disclose maintaining by the first control unit, first address data corresponding to the plurality of external devices; and maintaining by the second control unit, second address data corresponding to the plurality of external devices. However, Kinoshita discloses a switching system wherein a plurality of logical ports is associated with each of a plurality of physical ports, wherein the logical ports are grouped together according to a virtual-LAN configuration and the switching/routing system maintains addresses associated with the groupings (see columns 2-4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the control processors of Ganmukhi each maintain the address of a plurality of external devices, as taught in Kinoshita, as Kinoshita points out in column 2 lines 26-43, doing so would allow the interfaces to communicate with an increased number of other network nodes without having to increase the number of physical ports.

Art Unit: 2662

Referring to claim 14, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ganmukhi discloses that the first control unit maintains the first address data and the second control unit maintains the second address data each according to at least one of a plurality of routing protocols (the control processors have memory and control the operations of multiple protocols such as ATM and Ethernet and therefore each inherently maintains addresses of nodes it needs to communicate with (see figure 2 and column 2)).

Referring to claim 16, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ganmukhi discloses that the first control unit is associated with a first network address and the second control unit is associated with a second network address (each of the control processors are implemented on separate cards that are inserted into a card cage and communicate over busses and back channels, therefore inherently there must be addresses associated with these cards in order for data to be sent to the active control processor (see figure 1 and columns 2,4 and 5)).

Referring to claim 17, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Ganmukhi does not disclose that the second network address is derived from the first network address. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to derive the first address from the second address, because doing so is merely a matter of design choice.

6. Claims 5 and 15, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganmukhi in view of Kinoshita and further in view of Tappan (USPN 6,473,421), hereafter referred to as Tappan.

Art Unit: 2662

Referring to claims 5 and 15, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above.

Ganmukhi does not disclose that the one or more data transmission protocols include OSPF.

However, Tappan discloses a switching system that uses OSPF for routing packets (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this type of routing in Ganmukhi because as Tappan points out OSPF is used by nodes for exchanging topological information with other nodes (see column 4 lines 51-67)). Therefore, this implementation would make Ganmukhi more reliable, versatile and flexible.

7. Claim 11, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganmukhi in view of Kinoshita and Ofek and further in view of Michelson (USPN 5481673), hereafter referred to as Michelson.

Referring to claim 11, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Ganmukhi does not disclose that the network status information is maintained in a routing table. However, Michelson discloses a switching system wherein status information, such as the availability or unavailability of particular routes, is stored in routing tables (see claim 1 and column 4 lines 38-43). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to store status information in routing tables in the system of Ganmukhi, as taught in the system of Michelson, because doing so would allow the switching process of Ganmukhi to be performed in a more time-efficient manner. Namely, knowing the availability and unavailability of the links in Ganmukhi would help save processing time since routes that are not available would not be considered as possible data paths by the switch. Furthermore, the use of a routing table allows for a quick reference the switch can use to determine data paths and storing the status

Art Unit: 2662

information in such a table will allow the switch to access the status of the determined paths all in one place (i.e. the routing table) rather than having to go to separate memories to gather such information, thereby further making the switching process of Ganmukhi more time-efficient.

8. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganmukhi in view of Kinoshita.

Referring to claim 18, Ganmukhi discloses a method of representing a plurality of physical data communication ports such that either one of a first control unit and a second control unit can communicate with any of a plurality of external devices communicatively coupled to both the first and second control units if the other of the first and second control units fails (see figure 1 and columns 1 and 2)). Ganmukhi does not disclose that the physical ports correspond to a plurality of logical data communications ports. However, Kinoshita discloses a system wherein each physical port comprises a plurality of logical ports (see column 2 lines 31-50). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the interfaces of Ganmukhi comprise a plurality of logical ports as discloses in Kinoshita because, as Kinoshita points out in column 2 lines 26-43, doing so would allow the interfaces to communicate with an increased number of other network nodes without having to increase the number of physical ports. Furthermore, Ganmukhi does not disclose that the method discussed above is performed using a storage medium in conjunction with a plurality of executable instructions (i.e. software based implementation). However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the system of Ganmukhi in a software

Art Unit: 2662

based manner rather than hardware based because software implementations cost less and are easier to upgrade than hardware implementations.

Referring to claim 19, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Ganmukhi does not disclose that the system is operable to perform the steps of maintaining by the first control unit, first address data corresponding to the plurality of external devices; and maintaining by the second control unit, second address data corresponding to the plurality of external devices.

However, Kinoshita discloses a switching system wherein a plurality of logical ports is associated with each of a plurality of physical ports, wherein the logical ports of each physical port are grouped together according to a virtual-LAN configuration and the switching system maintains addresses associated with the groupings (see columns 2-4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the control processors of Ganmukhi each maintain the address of a plurality of external devices, as taught in Kinoshita, as Kinoshita points out in column 2 lines 26-43, doing so would allow the interfaces to communicate with an increased number of other network nodes without having to increase the number of physical ports.

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganmukhi in view Kinoshita and further in view of Laor (USPN 6,147,996), hereafter referred to as Laor.

Referring to claim 20, Ganmukhi discloses the system discussed above. Ganmukhi does not disclose that the system performs layer 2 and/or layer 3 switching. However, Laor discloses of a switching system that performs layer 2 and layer 3 switching (see abstract and column 1 lines 46-52). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2662

implement level 2 and 3 switching in the system of Ganmukhi because doing so would allow the switch to perform more operations such as processing packets independently and asynchronously and the reordering of packets into their proper order, as pointed out in Laor in column 1 lines 55-59, thereby making the system of Ganmukhi more versatile.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 and 3-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Note, no amendments have been made to claim 18 and thus they are still rejected for the same reasons as discussed in previous rejections and as repeated above. Also, the Applicant argues on page 11 last paragraph that claim 18 is patentable over Ganmukhi, Kinoshita and Laor. However, only Ganmukhi and Kinoshita were used to reject claim 18.

Conclusion


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Odland, who can be reached at (703) 305-3231 on Monday – Friday during the hours of 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached at (703) 305-4744. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist, who can be reached at (703) 305-4750.

deo

December 5, 2003


JOHN PEZZLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER